

1 BY MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

2 Q. The individual you spoke to at Bell South
3 is responsible for the OSS enhancement that Bell
4 South put into place?

5 A. I'm not sure that that's true.

6 Q. Okay. Did you try to contact the person at
7 Bell South that would -- that oversees the OSS
8 enhancement that provides loop makeup information
9 up to ten loops?

10 A. My call to Bell South was strictly on a
11 basis to determine if, in fact, they had initiated
12 or had been involved in any Telcordia proceedings.

13 Q. Okay. So the answer is, no, that you did
14 not contact -- try to contact the person that is
15 responsible for overseeing -- overseeing
16 implementation of loop makeup information for up to
17 ten loops?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. Mr. Zills, when you spoke to this
20 individual at Bell South, did you ask if the
21 \$10 million that they allegedly spent to develop a
22 system was solely related to providing loop makeup

1 information on ten loops or if there were other
2 costs, other -- did you ask if that was the sole
3 basis for the \$10 million?

4 A. No. Actually, I didn't get to that level
5 of detail. It was a call just in generalities to
6 find out what, if anything, they were doing to
7 accommodate the CLEC requests in their environment.
8 It was really nonspecific.

9 The \$10 million was just mentioned by
10 happenstance.

11 Q. Okay. Did you confirm during this call
12 that, in fact, Bell South is providing CLECs with
13 loop makeup information on up to ten loops?

14 A. Honestly, I don't recall.

15 Q. Okay. Did you ask if they spent that money
16 and actually achieved some kind of OSS
17 functionality?

18 A. Like I said, the call was in generalities.
19 We were just -- I was just calling to find out
20 what, if anything, that they were, in fact, doing
21 or had an association with Telcordia to accommodate
22 the request.

1 Q. And did you make that call to determine how
2 much it would cost Ameritech to implement a similar
3 functionality?

4 A. No. Actually there was no reference to
5 what it would cost Ameritech for the enhancement.

6 Q. Okay. And did Bell South indicate that the
7 \$10 million figure was solely cost from Telcordia?

8 A. The \$10 million mentioned was, in fact, for
9 Telcordia costs. Costs over and above that or
10 aside for their operational impair, I don't know
11 of. That wasn't discussed.

12 I'm not a -- person. So I wouldn't
13 have any idea of the relationship of what it would
14 take to actually put that into place in their
15 environment.

16 Q. Did you ask if Telcordia was doing
17 something other than or in addition to loop makeup
18 information for up to ten loops for that
19 \$10 million figure?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Okay. So, in essence, you called and you
22 said have you worked with Telcordia; and they said,

1 yes. Is that the sum of your conversation with
2 Bell South?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And just out of the blue the Bell South
5 person said, Oh, by the way, it costs \$10 million?

6 A. Actually, I believe that's true.

7 Q. Okay. And then you terminated the call?

8 A. No. I wouldn't be that crass.

9 Q. You said good-bye and then terminated the
10 call?

11 A. In speaking with a peer as it were in this
12 particular case, we exchange information; but I
13 honestly do not recall any specifics to get into
14 more detail to where Bell South was and what they
15 intended to do. We just exchanged niceties and
16 some information and the \$10 million figure came
17 up; and, essentially, that was all I really
18 retained other than the lady's name.

19 Q. Okay. So you don't know if the \$10 million
20 figure are the costs required to upgrade or alter
21 LFACS to provide loop makeup information on up to
22 ten loops?

1 A. No. Actually, I don't. I don't know what
2 the total expenditure costs would have entailed.

3 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me that Bell
4 South has loop makeup information in LFACS to your
5 knowledge?

6 A. It's possible. I don't know that for a
7 fact.

8 Q. Would you agree with me that LFACS was
9 developed by Telcordia and sold to various
10 incumbent carriers?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And so Telcordia would have sold the system
13 to Bell South?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And Telcordia similarly sold the system to
16 Ameritech?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. So at one time the systems probably
19 were nearly identical if not identical?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. So if Telcordia did, in fact,
22 produce some kind of package upgrade that allowed

1 Bell South to provide loop makeup information on up
2 to ten loops, that Telcordia package upgrade would
3 be available so for other incumbent carriers to use
4 for their LFACS system; is that correct?

5 A. Possibly.

6 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me that if
7 Telcordia has developed a package, an off-the-shelf
8 package, it would be cheaper for the second
9 incumbent carrier or another incumbent carrier to
10 purchase the package than for the first incumbent
11 carrier?

12 A. I'm not sure how the shared costs would
13 evolve or would actually be split between the
14 second of the two parties. The issue at hand here
15 is how the operating systems or the backup of the
16 system actually interfaced.

17 LFACS being the common denominator, if
18 you will, from AIT to Bell South is, in fact,
19 common; but its working systems and interconnecting
20 systems are not the same throughout all of the box
21 -- the regional RBOCs, bell operating companies.

22 Q. Fair enough.

1 But there are commonalities between the
2 LFACS systems across incumbent carriers?

3 A. Indeed.

4 Q. So presumably the Telcordia upgrade in the
5 Bell South region would have applicability to
6 Ameritech if it had to provide the same
7 functionality; would you agree with that?

8 A. Only from the LFACS perspective. Again, I
9 cannot attest to what other systems are connected
10 to them or support systems, I don't know that.

11 Q. Okay. I understand, and I understand --
12 is it true that you're here for the LFACS subject
13 matter?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. So understanding that I'm just asking you
16 at this time about LFACS, you would agree with me
17 that any upgrade to Bell South's LFACS system to
18 provide the functionality and the loop makeup
19 information up to ten loops if that were required
20 would apply to Ameritech systems as well?

21 A. Rephrase that for me, please.

22 Q. Sure. Let me back up.

1 I think in your testimony you're
2 presuming that, if I understand, on page 8 that the
3 \$10 million system -- the \$10 million cost was
4 related to Telcordia; is that correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. And that's an assumption that you're
7 making; is that correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. And you're assuming that Telcordia
10 had to -- the \$10 million in Telcordia costs,
11 which you're assuming, was related to loop makeup
12 information on up to ten loops; is that correct,
13 that's what you're saying on page 8?

14 A. I believe that was included in the
15 conversation.

16 Q. Okay. You're not saying that the Telcordia
17 upgrade was required for loop reservation that's
18 available in Bell South?

19 A. It was mentioned.

20 Q. Okay. So you're not certain what portion
21 of Telcordia charges were related to loop
22 reservation which is not applicable here; is that

1 correct?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Okay. Versus what, if any, portions of
4 Telecordia's charges were related to loop makeup
5 information available on up to ten loops?

6 A. That's true. I have no idea of the monies
7 to be divided or how it was to be expended.

8 Q. Okay. And you would agree and you
9 understand that the Commission here is not
10 requiring Ameritech to create or purchase a system
11 that will allow for loop reservation?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. So any costs that Bell South may have
14 incurred for that system would not -- would not
15 come into play here at Ameritech; is that correct?

16 A. If it was solely purchased by them it
17 certainly would not be in play here.

18 Q. Okay. Mr. Zills, is it true that LFACS
19 today returns complete loop makeup -- or complete
20 information on up to two loops?

21 A. Complete information on up to two loops.
22 When queried at the address level, that is true.

1 Q. Okay. Is it true that LFACS currently
2 returns partial information on up to 50 loops when
3 queried at the address level?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. If available.

7 Q. If available.

8 And do you have any knowledge outside of
9 LFACS what happens when the information leaves the
10 LFACS database?

11 A. You mean in the pre-order process?

12 Q. Yes.

13 A. No.

14 Q. Okay. So all --

15 A. May I, please.

16 Q. Sure.

17 A. When you asked me if I had any knowledge, I
18 have a reasonable understanding of the enhancement
19 for CR-69A that's going to occur. The loop
20 selection process is going to be enhanced to a
21 degree that is going to search and, if available,
22 seek a nonloading copper pair, if available, and

1 the associated loop makeup.

2 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that LFACS
3 has loop makeup information on all of the loops in
4 Ameritech's network?

5 A. No, that is not true.

6 Q. Okay. Is it that it has partial loop
7 makeup information on all of the loops?

8 A. No, that is not true.

9 Q. Okay. ARES, however, does have 100 percent
10 actual loop makeup; is that correct?

11 A. ARES is our database for loop makeup
12 retrieval.

13 Q. Okay. So does it have actual loop makeup
14 information for 100 percent of Ameritech's loops?

15 A. Being that it is, in fact, a data records
16 keeping system and it is input and updated by
17 human, that they are in it and it's always subject
18 to have some error.

19 Q. Okay. Except for human error inputs, which
20 it does have information, it's just that you're
21 testifying that sometimes there's an error in the
22 information that's housed in ARES?

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me that LFACS
3 contains certain information that is provided to
4 competitive local exchange carrier as part of a
5 loop makeup information request?

6 A. Yes. There are many loops contained in the
7 LFACS database that have loop makeup applicable to
8 them. One of the items that has been discussed
9 previously about the return two loops on the
10 initial inquiry at the address level needs, I
11 think, further definition.

12 When loop makeup exists, when the query
13 is made at the address level, LFACS reports back
14 all of the information relevant to that loop, all
15 of the attributes of the loop, the cable impair,
16 the serving terminal, the customer address, and
17 other attributes.

18 The loop makeup flag, if you will, in
19 fact, reports back that loop makeup exists. It
20 does not provide the actual loop makeup. It merely
21 gives an indicator. If, in fact, the facility is
22 loaded within that return loop information for

1 those two loops, there is a flag for a field that's
2 set in there that says loop -- I'm sorry -- load
3 equals H88 if that happens to be the type of
4 loading information.

5 But if loop makeup is, again, relevant
6 to that particular loop, it merely sends a flag
7 back to the user and says loop makeup exists.

8 Q. Okay. Let me make sure I understand your
9 testimony.

10 You're indicating that there's --
11 there's an identifier for at least two loops that
12 you've advised Ameritech that loop makeup
13 information exists; is that correct?

14 A. If loop makeup is applicable to the two
15 loops that are immediately identified and returned,
16 yes.

17 Q. Okay. And LFACS -- I mean, Ameritech
18 systems could theoretically possibly query LFACS to
19 get loop makeup information on those two loops?

20 A. Being that the information started in the
21 LFACS database and are, in fact, archived could be
22 anywhere from one date to ten years of age, yes.

1 Q. And could Ameritech systems query LFACS to
2 obtain loop makeup information up to 50 loops?

3 A. I'm not sure that I understand that.

4 Q. I think you indicated they have an
5 identifier that -- an identifier is provided to
6 the Middleware; is that correct?

7 A. Yes, and the first two loops return when
8 queried at the address level if the loop makeup
9 does, in fact, exist, yes.

10 Q. And could Ameritech systems use a circuit
11 ID information provided on the remaining loops to
12 query its systems regarding the other loops that
13 may be available to serve that user?

14 A. If your question is regarding whether loop
15 makeup exists and by doing a query at the circuit
16 level, that could be performed.

17 Q. So Ameritech systems are capable of doing
18 that?

19 A. I'm sorry?

20 Q. Are capable of performing a query to
21 get -- to get information on the other loops, the
22 up to 50 loops using the circuit ID?

1 A. Using circuit ID one circuit at a time,
2 yes.

3 Q. And those circuit IDs are provided to the
4 Middleware whenever you query LFACS?

5 A. The return 48 loops if, in fact, the
6 address were large enough to contain such, which 50
7 is the ultimate maximum if there were additionally
8 48 loops working there and if the LFACS database
9 contained the loop makeup and if the query was at
10 the working telephone number level then, yes, you
11 could obtain the loop makeup relevant to each one
12 keeping in mind that the data is again archived.

13 One of the things, I think, that is
14 grossly overlooked here is that AITs at large has a
15 tremendous advantage over the other operating
16 companies inasmuch as we have an ARES database to
17 give us live real time information .

18 JUDGE MORAN: Is there an average number of
19 loops at an address.

20 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, it's hard to say. In
21 a residential environment I'd like to believe that
22 today because more and more people are using modems

1 that are not accessing such, I guess I can be safe
2 in saying in some areas two; in others, perhaps in
3 the outlying areas, maybe only one; perhaps another
4 depending on the financial availability of the
5 persons there could be four. I really don't know
6 that.

7 BY MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

8 Q. Can I ask you, Mr. Zills, when you say
9 that, you mean four working telephone numbers,
10 right?

11 A. Yes. That was my reference to working
12 lines.

13 Q. Okay. It is -- would you agree with me
14 that typically an end user has more than one loop
15 that may be available to serve that particular
16 residence or business?

17 A. Define typically by percentage so I can
18 help you with that.

19 Q. I guess the question is:

20 What percentage would you -- what
21 percentage, in your experience, what percentage of
22 households or businesses have more than one

1 loop -- one spare loop available to serve their
2 business or residence?

3 A. That's a very broad question. I'm not sure
4 that I can answer that. In fact, I can't answer
5 that.

6 Q. Okay. But you asked me to put a percentage
7 on it, so you must have had a percentage in your
8 mind; didn't you?

9 A. Well, I was thinking about that for the
10 area where I live and, typically, in the
11 subdivision where I'm at I dare say but for three
12 or four homes. I dare say that everybody in that
13 area has but one loop working at their location.

14 Q. I'm asking about working. I'm asking about
15 spare loops. All right.

16 Is there a -- there is a distinction
17 between a working loop and a spare loop; correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And my question was focussed on
20 spare loops. I understand that often maybe just a
21 person has one working line.

22 Is it your understanding that when

1 Ameritech builds its network, it builds spare
2 capacity?

3 A. Spare capacity, yes.

4 Q. So that means that at that time it's
5 constructing its network, it does have spare loops
6 that are built?

7 A. Spare capacity I agree to.

8 Q. Okay. So you wouldn't agree on spare
9 loops?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Okay. Would you agree that there are
12 customers that have spare loops available to serve
13 their residence or business?

14 A. Only under two conditions can that occur.
15 A previously disconnected service at a given
16 location or, in fact, a brand new environment such
17 as a high-rise building where we have preconnected
18 or preterminated facilities available for an
19 incoming.

20 Q. Okay. Is it your testimony then that when
21 LFACS returns two loops, is that typical that it
22 returns two loops in response to Middleware query

1 --

2 A. If --

3 Q. -- loop makeup?

4 A. Yes, if available.

5 Q. Is it your experience that LFACS typically
6 returns information up to two loops usually two
7 loops are available?

8 A. That varies from household to household.
9 In a business environment I would say certainly.
10 In a residential environment, I can't say that
11 that's true.

12 Q. Mr. Zills, is it possible for Ameritech to
13 transfer the information in LFACS or ARES in some
14 kind of database down to competitive local exchange
15 carriers?

16 A. Is it possible?

17 Q. Mm-hmm.

18 A. I'm sure that a data transfer could be
19 established to do that, yes.

20 Q. Okay. Would you agree that a database dump
21 or a database transfer would consume or require
22 fewer resources from Ameritech than constructing or

1 changing its Middleware in other requirement -- or
2 other -- in other portions of Ameritech's OSS to
3 comply with the Commission's order?

4 A. It would seem so, but I cannot attest to
5 that.

6 Q. Okay. Mr. Zills, you indicate in your
7 testimony, in your direct testimony on page 4 and
8 5, you express concern that if a CLEC were allowed
9 to somehow tag a loop, it may not get the loop
10 that, in fact, is best for the CLEC service; is
11 that correct?

12 A. Which lines were you referenced to.

13 Q. I'm kind of looking at your pages 4 and 5
14 of your direct. If you want to take a moment, you
15 can.

16 A. Thank you. Could you restate your
17 question, please.

18 Q. Sure.

19 I'm just confirming that in your direct
20 testimony your concern is that if -- in part, that
21 if a CLEC were allowed to tag a loop as required by
22 the Commission's order in this proceeding, that

1 perhaps the CLEC would end up with not the best,
2 quote-unquote, loop to provide its service?

3 A. That's true.

4 Q. Would you agree that if the CLEC is willing
5 to take that supposed risk, that it should be
6 allowed to do so?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Is it -- and why should a CLEC not be able
9 to determine what loop would best provide -- be
10 best to provide its service with?

11 A. The hierarchy within the out back system
12 today provides the very best loop based on the
13 transmission requirements of the request that we
14 receive as we understand it or has been conveyed to
15 us. Therefore, using that same hierarchy developed
16 by Telcordia, we, in fact, provision loops for all
17 customers, retail, wholesale, a totally silent C.
18 In other words, we make no assumption and we make
19 no assignment measure regardless of who the
20 customer is.

21 I have every reason to believe that
22 LFACS assigns the very best that it can based on

1 the information given it.

2 Q. Okay. Would you agree that the CLEC has
3 more information about the service it intends to
4 provide than Ameritech?

5 A. That's an interesting question. I believe
6 by definition the CLEC perhaps has a need for their
7 definition of a better loop as to the LFACS
8 definition of a qualified loop; but given no more
9 information on what I have at the service request
10 honoring such items off of the service orders
11 sufficient as service code, the line assigned it by
12 code and the class of service code. LFACS and that
13 system can only make the assumption, if you will,
14 mechanically, to assign the best loop available at
15 that time.

16 Q. I guess my question is:

17 Would you agree that the CLEC is in a
18 better position to determine what is the best loop
19 to provide the service?

20 A. I suppose.

21 Q. Okay. But today Ameritech is making that
22 determination; is that correct?

1 A. Ameritech's LFACS system is providing and
2 provisioning an information reactionary to the
3 service order that it receives, yes.

4 Q. Okay. On page 5 of your direct, Mr. Zills,
5 you make reference to the fact that to comply with
6 Commission's order, there would have to be changes
7 to the LSR order form?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Is that correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And you indicate that Ameritech Illinois
12 cannot change the content in fields of the LSR on
13 its own; is that correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Isn't it true that Ameritech doesn 't always
16 follow the ordering and billing form requirements
17 for LSRs?

18 A. I can't answer that.

19 Q. Okay. Meaning you don't have any knowledge
20 of that?

21 A. It's my understanding that to get an agreed
22 to change whereby the LSR formats to be changed and

1 useable by all the CLECs, there has to be an agreed
2 to standard.

3 Q. Okay. So --

4 JUDGE MORAN: Counsel, are you on the direct
5 testimony?

6 MS. NAUGHTON: I think you're on rebuttal.

7 JUDGE MORAN: Okay. Because that --

8 MS. NAUGHTON: That seems to be the page.

9 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: I apologize. You're
10 absolutely correct. I'm on rebuttal, page 5. I
11 apologize. Thank you for clarifying.

12 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: In light of the fact that
13 Mr. Zills is not familiar, Covad would like to
14 make an on-the record data request for Ameritech to
15 answer the question whether Ameritech always
16 follows the ordering and billing requirement for
17 LSRs, which is what Mr. Zills seems to indicate
18 occurs on page 5 of his rebuttal.

19 JUDGE MORAN: Okay. That will be allowed unless
20 Mr. Mitchell can testify to that. Is that beyond
21 your scope?

22 MR. MITCHELL: It truly is.

1 JUDGE MORAN: Okay.

2 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: If I can have just a
3 moment.

4 BY MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

5 Q. Mr. Zills, are you aware of any method in
6 place today that would allow a competitive local
7 exchange carrier to see loop makeup information on
8 more than one loop?

9 A. No.

10 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Just quickly scanning. I
11 think I may have no further questions. I just want
12 to confirm.

13 Actually, I realize that Mr. Coelho
14 referred a question to Mr. Zills. I better take my
15 opportunity now.

16 BY MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

17 Q. Mr. Zills, I think you indicated that
18 you're familiar with the enhancement, the
19 August 31st, 2001 OSS enhancement that will search
20 for loaded noncopper -- I'm sorry -- a copper
21 nonloaded loop?

22 A. You're referring to CR-69A.

1 Q. I have to remember that's what you call it.

2 CR-69A, that's the same enhancement I
3 was just referring to that's projected to be in
4 place by the end of August?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. And you're familiar with how it
7 prioritizes loops?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. Would you -- would you agree with
10 me that perhaps depending on the type of DSL
11 service that a CLEC provides, that prioritization
12 may not apply to the CLEC?

13 A. Based on the current knowledge for services
14 that are being requested through Ameritech
15 Illinois' provisioning systems, if all of the
16 services are, in fact, serviceable only by a
17 nonloaded copper loop, then I agree. However, if
18 you have any service within that range that has the
19 ability to be served by anything other than or in
20 addition to a nonloaded copper loop such as DOC
21 environment, I still maintain that we're doing the
22 very best provisioning.

1 Q. Okay. So you agree with me that perhaps
2 the CLEC could look at multiple loop makeup
3 information or loop makeup information on multiple
4 loops it would prioritize that loop differently
5 than Ameritech, the loops differently than
6 Ameritech would?

7 A. No, that's not what I said.

8 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me that
9 depending on the service a CLEC may provide, it
10 could prefer a loop provision over DLC to a
11 loop -- a loaded copper loop?

12 A. Absolutely.

13 Q. Okay. But through loop qualification, it
14 would never know that perhaps that loop certified
15 DLC was available; is that correct?

16 A. Sure.

17 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Okay. I'm doing a quick
18 scan to make sure there's nothing Mr. Coelho
19 referred to you. I can't lose my opportunity.

20 I think that's all the cross-examination
21 that Covad has at this time for Mr. Zills.

22 JUDGE MORAN: I'm going to ask you a question,

1 Mr. Zills.

2 EXAMINATION

3 BY

4 JUDGE MORAN:

5 Q. All the different DSLs, do they all run in
6 the same type of loop or does every different type
7 of DSL require different things?

8 A. Your Honor, anything less than a DS3 level
9 service, meaning extremely high digital data
10 service, can be provisioned with a copper pair.
11 Copper is the universal transport system, if you
12 will.

13 Preferably in the digital data
14 environment the facility has to be a nonloaded
15 environment. However, there are many different
16 flavors of the DSL service; and some of those, in
17 fact, can be provided over DLC. So I don't want to
18 preclude the fact that DLC is totally unavailable
19 in an event that a new service offering were to be
20 offered by a CLEC and have us be held, if you will,
21 at fault in saying you only provided me a copper
22 nonloaded loop when, in fact, this service could be

1 provisioned over a DLC.

2 If that information is not somehow
3 conveyed to me into my provisioning system, I won't
4 know that.

5 Q. Okay. So some services can run the DLC,
6 but everything else can go on the other -- the
7 regular copper unloaded loop, right?

8 A. That is correct. All of them can always be
9 served on the nonloaded copper loop.

10 Q. Okay. And some can also be served by this?

11 A. That's correct.

12 JUDGE MORAN: Okay. Thank you.

13 Do you have more questions, Staff?

14 MR. BRADY: Yes.

15 JUDGE MORAN: Okay, please.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY

18 MR. BRADY:

19 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Zills. I'm Sean Brady.
20 I represent Staff of the Illinois Commerce
21 Commission. Happy Birthday.

22 A. Thank you.

1 Q. I guess the -- I guess since -- I want to
2 follow up on one of the questions that Hearing
3 Examiner Moran just asked you regarding the return
4 of nonloaded cooper loops.

5 Are you familiar with what percentage of
6 the network is nonloaded copper loop at this point?

7 A. No, I'm not.

8 Q. All right. Mr. Zills, turning your
9 attention to your direct testimony on page 4, I
10 need to get some things kind of cleared up in my
11 head.

12 On page 4, line 7, you refer to the
13 service order analysis and control; is that a
14 system? It just says service analysis and control,
15 is that a system?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. All right. And is there an acronym; is
18 that usually known as SOAC?

19 A. SOAC.

20 Q. SOAC, okay, S-O-A-C?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Now, you refer to SOAC as being an upfront

1 system?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. What do you mean by an upfront system?

4 A. Sure. I'll be glad to explain.

5 Service order processing begins after

6 the service order is initiated and made entering

7 into the provisioning network. SOAC, in fact,

8 intercepts that service order and makes a

9 determination of several of the attributes

10 including, as listed in here, the service code, if

11 it's available on the service order --

12 Q. Can I interrupt you for a second because

13 you're moving very quickly.

14 You said "intercepts"?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. When you say intercepts, you make it sound

17 like it's going -- it should be going to someplace

18 else or it might go to someplace else in other

19 situations. Will it always --

20 A. Always.

21 Q. -- go from the local service --

22 JUDGE MORAN: You can't both talk at the same

1 time.

2 BY MR. BRADY:

3 Q. So it would always go from the local
4 service request form where it's intaking the
5 information and would always go to SOAC, correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay.

8 JUDGE MORAN: Are you finished with the answer
9 to the original question?

10 BY MR. BRADY:

11 Q. I'm sorry. I cut you off.

12 Can you continue or do you want me to
13 rephrase the question that I asked before?

14 JUDGE MORAN: Please, rephrase the question.

15 BY MR. BRADY:

16 Q. Okay. What is it that you mean by an
17 upfront system?

18 A. After a service order is initiated into the
19 provision network, service order requests, all, are
20 sent to SOAC for evaluation using various data
21 fields that are actually on the service order
22 request excluding -- always excluding the customer

1 name. Because the provisioning systems make no
2 records and make no evaluation on who the customer
3 is. We are totally blind to that aspect.

4 The values that are determined by using
5 individual code sets relevant to the service code,
6 the USI code, et cetera, are sent down to LFACS for
7 a provisioning requirement. LFACS uses that data
8 to best determine what is the facility that's
9 available, that is compatible, that is spare and
10 hopefully preconnect them at the individual address
11 location.

12 Q. All right. Let's go back to the beginning.
13 The local service request form, what are -- are
14 there three inputs on that form or what kind of --
15 what inputs are we talking about?

16 A. There are numerous inputs.

17 Q. Numerous inputs, okay. That's fine.

18 The information from the local service
19 request form comes in to SOAC. Now, would you
20 consider that a --

21 JUDGE MORAN: Can you spell SOAC?

22 MR. BRADY: I had previously for her.

1 BY MR. BRADY:

2 Q. Would that function as a Middleware system
3 similar to SAM, are you familiar with SAM first of
4 all?

5 A. Relatively in its context used in prequal.

6 Q. You are familiar?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. So does it -- does SOAC then
9 function similar to SAM or how is it different?

10 A. SOAC is a system that was developed and is,
11 in fact, owned by Telcordia as most of our
12 provisioning pieces are.

13 The evaluation of the usefulness of SOAC
14 has many other options. There are many other
15 things besides just make the evaluation for the
16 service request and then sending it on through the
17 LFACS system or cable repair assignment. In
18 essence, it serves as being essentially a traffic
19 cop for data inasmuch as it makes sure that the
20 request is being responded to. If it does not, it
21 sends out an alarm or an alert to make a human
22 aware that this is a problem.

1 But it actually serves as a central
2 processing system per se to make sure that all of
3 the provisioning piece parts are actually adhered
4 to to provide service for that individual request.

5 Q. So it routes it to the proper -- next
6 proper system?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. All right. And in this situation as we're
9 discussing here, the next proper system is going to
10 be LFACS?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Now, what -- can you explain what the --
13 as I understand it, SOAC determines the outside
14 plant equivalency code?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Can you explain what that is?

17 A. Yes. The values that are contained within
18 the data fields of the service code if it is
19 available on the service order, the assignable line
20 USI (phonetic) code which is always available on
21 every service order, and the class of service code
22 which is always available on every service order.

1 The predetermined fields based on the
2 criteria that has been presented to us as can best
3 qualify and best serve are provisioned, that
4 particular loop are preset data elements. SOAC
5 uses a weighted value on determining these saying
6 that it's actually going to filter data down into
7 15 preset categories if the data is available for
8 any one of those 15.

9 It makes a determination -- I realize
10 this is higher level, but I'm trying to bring it
11 down to you. It makes a determination that's sent
12 to LFACS and it says to the LFACS system, send to
13 me or provide for me a facility that meets this
14 request for this or this requirement. LFACS will
15 do that. Even within the LFACS assignment system
16 itself, the facilities that reside there are that
17 weighted value meaning that if DLC can, in fact,
18 serve or provision that request, it is so powered
19 or weighted to do so.

20 In other words, there is a graduation
21 process during the entire provisioning system that
22 says this is the highest weighted, second highest

1 weighted and so forth; and, of course, metallic
2 being the lowest. And here's why, let me define
3 that if I can, please.

4 Metallic is the catchall. It will serve
5 essentially everything up to a DS3 level service.
6 But if I have the ability to transport a service
7 over a digital line carrier over a fiber network
8 which is faster, quicker, better, than we will
9 allow it to assign, if available and compatible
10 over and above a copper pair.

11 Q. All right. Taking you a few steps back in
12 what you were just talking about, you talked about
13 preset data and you talked about weighted values?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Who determined or chose these preset data
16 fields that were to be evaluated within SOAC; was
17 that Telcordia or -- do you know who did that?

18 A. The service code data elements are supplied
19 by Telcordia. The USI code elements are generally
20 determined by the operating company --

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. AIT in my case.

1 Q. And so there was no input from -- well,
2 let me back up. This system is also used in the
3 SWBT Region 8, correct?

4 A. The likeness of it, yes.

5 Q. A likeness of it, okay.

6 Now, in developing the -- this -- can
7 we call it an algorithm or --

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. In developing this system here for
10 Illinois for Ameritech region, was there any input
11 from any of the CLECs in developing that?

12 A. Actually, yes. The requirement given of us
13 for the DSL service offerings that they intended to
14 provide essentially boil down to a nonloaded copper
15 loop.

16 Q. Okay. When was this -- when did these
17 meetings happen, what -- when was this value set,
18 when did these meetings happen?

19 A. I can't answer that.

20 Q. Okay. So you don't know when these
21 meetings took place?

22 A. No.

1 Q. Do you know who was involved in these
2 meetings?

3 A. I can't answer that.

4 Q. All right. The other factor I want to talk
5 about was the weighted value you mentioned?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Now, this weighted value is a -- this is a
8 weighted value that is assigned to each preset data
9 element?

10 A. In the LFACS database for availability of a
11 service of a facility, yes.

12 Q. Okay. So that preweighted value is
13 assigned in LFACS not in SOAC?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Okay. Who determined what those weighted
16 values were?

17 A. Telcordia.

18 Q. Okay. And was -- do you know when that
19 was developed, how long ago that was developed?

20 A. I really don't know when the LFACS system
21 was developed in its infancy. I can't say that. I
22 do know that it was a collaborative agreement, if

1 you will, from the RBOCs to develop a system that
2 will accommodate mechanically an assignment
3 processing environment and given information and
4 certainly understandable elements such as cost
5 effectiveness, the use of digital line carrier
6 systems and such.

7 The preweighted values were determined
8 and rightfully so to provide or by existing a
9 digital line carrier if it happened to be available
10 at that site as a first higher weighted value over
11 and above perhaps a copper pair. If a facility is,
12 in fact, compatible to the service requests, LFACS
13 will always assign a digital line carrier facility
14 first. If it's not compatible, it does not
15 consider it.

16 The same issue applies to a loaded
17 facility. If the service cannot be provided over a
18 loaded facility, LFACS does not consider it.

19 Q. Was -- assigning these weighted values
20 were the CLECs contacted -- were the CLECs within
21 the Ameritech region, specifically Ameritech
22 Illinois, were they contacted or conferred with?

1 A. Not to my knowledge.

2 Q. So LFACS will, in the ordering stage, come
3 up with what is supposed to be the best loop or
4 optimum loop, correct, that's the way it's set up
5 right now?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. All right.

8 Now, say the CLEC says all right I want
9 that loop. All right. Then that information --
10 that information then goes to the facility's
11 assigner or where does that go then?

12 MS. NAUGHTON: For ordering or pre-ordering.

13 MR. BRADY: This is ordering.

14 THE WITNESS: Today the CLEC doesn't have the
15 opportunity to specify that particular loop or a
16 particular loop.

17 BY MR. BRADY:

18 Q. So they don't have the ability to choose?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. Okay. So then they would see that
21 information, it would go to the facility's assigner
22 and someone within Ameritech; the facility's

1 assigner eventually --

2 A. No.

3 Q. -- assigns it?

4 A. The service order manually will flow

5 through if, in fact, there is a spare compatible

6 facility available, the silent C.

7 Q. Now, I believe you said earlier that you

8 are familiar with the Southwestern Bell Telephone

9 loop qualification ordering systems or are you?

10 A. No, not in depth.

11 Q. Not in depth. Okay.

12 Do you know to the extent that whether

13 ARES, A-R-E-S, is also -- is used in the SWBT

14 region?

15 A. No, it's not. It's exclusively for AIT

16 region.

17 Q. What about specifically the Kansas -- the

18 Kansas, Oklahoma systems, are you familiar enough

19 to know if those systems are similar to Texas?

20 A. No, I can't answer that.

21 Q. Okay. Within the loop ordering process, is

22 ARES used at all in loop ordering?

1 A. No.

2 Q. So ARES is only loop makeup information
3 contained within ARES is only used in loop
4 qualification?

5 A. For CLEC request, that is correct.

6 Q. Would -- I guess then would Ameritech's
7 affiliate in ordering a loop for whatever reason be
8 accessing the ARES database?

9 A. No. There's no difference between the
10 requesting body as to whom they actually are. The
11 only time that loop makeup actually comes into
12 interplay within the service order processing flow
13 if, in fact, that service order is going to be
14 designed within our TERCs environment within the
15 Ameritech region.

16 Q. Do you still have your direct testimony
17 there in front of you?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. If you could turn to page 6, please?

20 A. 6?

21 Q. Yeah. In the -- on page 6 you referred to
22 a particular loop, one that was identified in

1 prequalification?

2 A. Yes. Explains the -- I'm sorry, please
3 repeat the question.

4 Q. Oh, I was saying, the context in which
5 you're referring to the particular loop in that
6 situation is in reference to loop qualification,
7 correct?

8 A. The context in use --

9 Q. I mean, it says right there in the
10 question. To order a particular loop from the loop
11 qualification report in the question itself?

12 MR. COVEY: I'm not clear what the question is
13 at this point.

14 BY MR. BRADY:

15 Q. I'm just trying to get him to the same
16 point as far as he's talking -- we're talking
17 about loop qualification right now, right, or --
18 in this question?

19 A. This is in the direct on page 6?

20 Q. I'm sorry, I've got --

21 JUDGE MORAN: The wrong testimony. Are you on
22 rebuttal?

1 MR. BRADY: I'm on the rehearing. I'm sorry,
2 no. It is direct.

3 JUDGE MORAN: Direct or rebuttal?

4 MR. BRADY: I have direct. The question on
5 lines 2, 3, and 4 is that --

6 JUDGE MORAN: Lines 2, 3, and 4 page 5?

7 MR. BRADY: Page 6.

8 JUDGE MORAN: Page 6, okay.

9 THE WITNESS: I'm with you now.

10 BY MR. BRADY:

11 Q. I'm sorry, sir. We're talking about
12 ordering a particular loop from a loop
13 qualification report.

14 Now, in answering this question you are
15 assuming, aren't you, that the current ordering
16 process which chooses -- Ameritech's current
17 ordering process which chooses the optimal loop
18 would be replaced by a process that would allow a
19 CLEC to order its tag loop?

20 A. No, not replaced. But the process
21 shouldn't be allowed to allow the selection of a
22 particular loop would have to run in concert or in

1 parallel with the existing system.

2 Q. All right. So it's to be developed in
3 concert.

4 So is it possible then to actually have
5 the option of saying -- like do a search through
6 -- let me?

7 JUDGE MORAN: Do you want to take a minute,
8 rephrase your question, and allow the court
9 reporter to put in her paper.

10 (Recess taken.)

11 BY MR. BRADY:

12 Q. Mr. Zills, in your previous answer you said
13 that having a tagging and the current loop ordering
14 system would have to be developed somewhat in
15 concert or parallel to each other?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. So in your opinion is it possible that an
18 option could be offered where the CLEC could choose
19 to either use Ameritech's current loop provisioning
20 system or loop ordering system or would allow them
21 to choose some sort of unique identifier --

22 A. Well --

1 Q. -- if that was possible -- if it was
2 possible if there was a unique identifier in the
3 system?

4 A. The second of the two items that you
5 mention is cause for great concern.

6 Number one, today there's not a way to
7 tag or identify a cable repair. Then to convey
8 that information by this tagged value onto the LSR,
9 then make that association from the LSR into our
10 current provisioning systems, feed that same data
11 down into SOAC and into the LFACS environment on
12 hopes or pretense that that cable repairs there can
13 be assigned. That's a massive undertaking.

14 Q. But it is -- it's an undertaking that
15 could be accomplished?

16 A. I suppose.

17 Q. Okay. On page 4 of your rebuttal testimony
18 -- let me know when you get there.

19 On lines 17 through 19 of your rebuttal
20 testimony you state that tossing aside the optimal
21 loop system in favor of a pick-a-loop system would
22 allow CLECs to play a role in managing Ameritech's

1 network inventory; isn't that correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Now, just to clarify, in that situation you
4 are assuming that the optimal loop process would be
5 replaced entirely by the pick-a-loop process or no?

6 A. It appears that the pick-a-loop process
7 would totally ignore the hierarchy that LFACS
8 chooses a compatible facility available for the
9 service request, yes.

10 Q. So, yes, you are ignoring it or, yes,
11 you're affirming what you just said?

12 A. The message I'm trying to convey is that in
13 the pick-a-loop system, first of all, there's no
14 guarantee that the facility would be available at
15 the time that the service order or the LSR evolved
16 into a service order and its availability.

17 Second, the pick-a-loop system may not,
18 in fact, even exist if they were a noncompatible
19 facility as a data returned back to the
20 pre-ordering process that may show or may appear to
21 show that there are no compatible facilities
22 available. However, there could be some ability

1 within LFACS to assemble a loop or even provide an
2 LST, a line and station process to create this
3 compatible facility for the request.

4 Q. Okay. I want to jump into something a
5 little bit different.

6 You are generally familiar with the ARES
7 system as it's used in the loop qualification?

8 A. Generally, yes.

9 Q. Is that maintained by Telcordia?

10 A. I believe the ARES system is -- the
11 software that supports the ARES system is by
12 Intergraph --

13 Q. Intergraph.

14 A. -- corporation.

15 Q. All right.

16 A. I'd have to refer to the subject matter
17 expert in that field for a confirmation, but I
18 believe that's correct.

19 Q. On --I needed -- I'm sorry, I'm going to
20 have you jump back to your direct testimony on page
21 6, lines 15 to 23.

22 You're discussing specific costs to --

1 or activities that would need to be done to modify
2 Ameritech's systems to allow a CLEC to order a
3 particular loop as identified during a pre-order
4 would require a series of questions to be answered,
5 those being the questions on 19 through 23,
6 correct?

7 A. Could you restate your question for me
8 again, please.

9 Q. The questions that you are addressing here
10 are just -- you're just listing some of the
11 questions or things that need to be addressed as it
12 relates to specific costs to LFACS if you need to
13 modify LFACS?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Okay. Now, have you -- do you know how
16 long it would take to answer these questions and
17 develop a cost estimate?

18 A. No. Actually, I'd have to refer that to
19 someone in the cost analysis study group outside of
20 me. That wouldn't be me.

21 Q. Has this -- has this is been -- have these
22 questions been looked at currently to your

1 knowledge?

2 A. I believe there is some work being done on
3 it, but I could not tell you how much depth has
4 been developed on it thus far.

5 Q. I think -- I have actually a question
6 regarding ordering and billing form, and I realize
7 you had said you had to defer your question that
8 counsel from Covad posed to you, but this referred
9 to something a little bit different. So I'm going
10 to see if you actually possibly know this.

11 Does Ameritech sometimes use fields from
12 the local service request form for a purpose other
13 than what was specified by the ordering and billing
14 form?

15 A. I would have no idea.

16 MR. BRADY: Okay. We have no further questions.

17 JUDGE MORAN: Okay. Where are we at?

18 Everybody's finished cross.

19 Any redirect?

20 MR. COVEY: Can we take a minute?

21 JUDGE MORAN: Sure.

22 (Recess taken.)

1 MR. COVEY: Just a couple of questions on
2 redirect.

3 JUDGE MORAN: Thank you.

4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY

6 MR. COVEY:

7 Q. Mr. Zills, you were asked some questions
8 about work for Telcordia being done for Bell South
9 with regard to LFACS; do you remember those
10 questions?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Would whatever work Telcordia had done for
13 Bell South with respect to LFACS be directly
14 portable to Ameritech Illinois' LFACS?

15 A. No, because our support systems and the
16 provision systems are not exactly aligned in any of
17 the bell operating companies.

18 Q. You were also asked a question, I believe,
19 as to whether LFACS returns complete information on
20 two loops, and I think you said, yes; do you
21 remember that?

22 A. Yes, I did.

1 Q. Were you referring to complete loop makeup
2 information from LFACS?

3 A. No, I wasn't. As later defined, the
4 information returned at the address level when the
5 two loops are responded back through from LFACS,
6 the information contained certainly does have and
7 provide the information, the terminal address, and
8 other items like that.

9 But loop makeup data itself is not
10 contained within those fields. There is a tag that
11 says loop makeup exists. That's all.

12 MR. COVEY: That's all I have.

13 JUDGE MORAN: Okay.

14 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: No further cross.

15 JUDGE MORAN: Great. Thank you.

16 We've got another one we're going to try
17 to get through. You're sworn in. Go ahead.

18

19

20 MELHIA CARTER,
21 called as a witness herein, having been previously
22 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY

3 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

4 Q. Could you please state your name and
5 business address for the record.

6 A. My name is Melhia Carter. My business
7 address is 227 West Monroe, 420, Chicago, Illinois
8 60606.

9 Q. And by whom are you employed and in what
10 capacity?

11 A. I'm employed by Covad Communications as
12 director of ILEC relations and external affairs.

13 Q. Do you have a copy of what has been marked
14 as Covad Exhibit 1.0 as entitled Rebuttal Testimony
15 of Melhia Carter?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. Do you have any exchanges or
18 additions to make to Covad Exhibit 1.0?

19 A. No.

20 Q. If I asked you the questions contained in
21 Covad Exhibit 1.0 here today, would your answers be
22 the same?

1 A. Yes.

2 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Covad now moves for the
3 admission of Covad Exhibit 1.0 into the record.

4 (Whereupon, Covad's
5 Exhibit No. 1.0 was
6 marked for identification.)

7 JUDGE MORAN: Are there any objections?

8 MR. BRADY: No.

9 JUDGE MORAN: No objections. It will be
10 admitted subject to cross.

11 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Covad tenders Ms. Carter
12 for cross-examination.

13 JUDGE MORAN: Staff, please.

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY

16 MR. BRADY:

17 Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Carter. My name is
18 Sean Brady. I'm staff for Illinois Commerce
19 Commission. I have a few questions.

20 Based on the previous case hearings and
21 today's hearings, is it your understanding that
22 Ameritech's August enhancement CR-9A or

1 whatever --

2 A. 69A.

3 Q. -- 69A will provide the nonloaded copper
4 loop; is that your understanding?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And currently Covad provides more than one
7 type of DSL service, correct?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. Now, in light of the fact that Covad
10 provides more than one type of DSL service, would a
11 nonloaded copper loop always be the optimal loop
12 for each of the DSL services you provide?

13 A. Generally a nonloaded copper loop would
14 work with the DSL services that we provide, yes.

15 Q. Are there particular situations where you
16 would prefer something else or you would -- Covad
17 would choose something else?

18 A. Well, there could be a situation where
19 maybe there's a shorter loop. For example --
20 okay, I'll throw out a hypothetical. There may be
21 a longer loop that provides IDSL service. We can
22 provision IDSL service, that is a nonloaded copper

1 pair and there could potentially be a shorter loop
2 that we could potentially provide a service such as
3 SDSL which we generally provide to business.

4 Presuming that the shorter loop has a
5 load coil on it, we may choose to condition that
6 loop and provide the SDSL service versus the slower
7 speed IDSL service to a specific customer.

8 Q. You said you may choose to condition that
9 loop.

10 Currently those charges would then be
11 incurred by Covad, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. Are you familiar at all with what those
14 kinds of charges are at this time?

15 A. I can't rattle them off the top of my head.
16 I know generally, but I can't rattle them off.

17 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Zills and I believe also
18 Mr. Hamilton talked about how Ameritech provides
19 that line -- line and station transfers in their
20 loop ordering process, and they talk about how it
21 seems to benefit CLECs.

22 What is -- I guess, what is Covad's

1 view on this?

2 A. My understanding -- and, again, I'm not an
3 engineer -- but my understanding is that generally
4 they'll do a line and station transfer when, for
5 example, the loop is going over a fiber -- that
6 digital loop carrier. They'll do a line and
7 station transfer to transition that loop over the
8 copper.

9 There may be a situation where perhaps
10 we can provide IDLC -- or IDSL over the fiber-based
11 loop versus transferring it onto the copper-based
12 loop; and, therefore, maybe we would want to use
13 the fiber-based loop.

14 Q. Okay. In the testimony in this proceeding
15 you indicate that there are certain IDSL services
16 in which fiber loops would best satisfy your needs?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. Now, for these reasons the information
19 provided by Ameritech under either the current
20 system or the August system is insufficient.

21 Is there other information that you
22 would need to know in the qualification stage to

1 provide that service?

2 A. Well, one example may be the existence of
3 repeaters; for example, SBC has a policy where they
4 will not allow Covad to put a repeater on a line.
5 We may have a longer loop that we want to provision
6 for IDSL and we may want to put a repeater on the
7 line to provide service to that customer.

8 We may get a loop that does not have a
9 repeater on it. There may be another loop in the
10 database that has a repeater; but because we're
11 given a loop that does not have a repeater and SBC
12 does have a policy that they will not allow us to
13 put a repeater on the line even if we want to pay
14 for it, we would have to tell the customer we can't
15 provide that service.

16 JUDGE MORAN: Can I ask a question?

17 THE WITNESS: Sure.

18 JUDGE MORAN: This repeater, are you saying that
19 if there's -- if there is a loop with a repeater,
20 that's what you want; but if you're given a loop
21 that doesn't have a repeater, you will not be
22 allowed to put a repeater on?

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct. There's certain
2 circumstances where a loop may be longer in length
3 and Covad could provide a service called IDSL over
4 that longer loop. However, SBC has a policy that
5 they will not allow us to put a repeater on the
6 line if it doesn't exist already.

7 So, therefore, the situation that we
8 typically run into in that scenario is that either
9 we try to put some CPE out there and if the CPE
10 fails, then --

11 JUDGE HAYNES: CPE?

12 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, customer provider
13 equipment. It's the equipment at the end user
14 premise.

15 We may put some CPE out there and if
16 that CPE fails, then we can't provide the service;
17 or if we just -- if we can't get a repeater in
18 some cases, we can't provide the service because
19 the loop is too long and they won't allow us to put
20 a repeater on the loop even if we want to pay for
21 it.

22 MR. BRADY: To me.

1 JUDGE MORAN: Sorry. Go ahead.

2 BY MR. BRADY:

3 Q. Ameritech Witness Mitchell in his rebuttal
4 testimony -- have you had a chance to read his
5 testimony?

6 A. I'm sorry, who?

7 Q. Ameritech Witness Mitchell, John Mitchell?

8 A. I may have skimmed through it.

9 Q. Well --

10 A. I probably can't attest to it in detail,
11 but. . .

12 Q. In his testimony he had discussed that it
13 would take about 18 months to make modifications of
14 an estimate, a rough estimate of 18 months, to make
15 modifications to the system to comply with the
16 order; and in part it was because these changes
17 needed to go through the change management process.

18 Based on the information and the
19 testimony that's been provided in this hearing,
20 would you agree with that estimate?

21 A. Well, I'm not an OSS -- OSS expert to
22 speak to that particularly, but what I can say is

1 that the UNE remand order did come out in, I
2 believe -- I believe the last date I think I
3 stated in my testimony where they had to comply
4 with different terms and conditions was
5 May 17th, 2000.

6 Obviously, they -- their witnesses have
7 stated during this hearing that they have put a
8 high priority on this enhancement that they have
9 not conferred with CLECs on whether this meets
10 their needs. So given the fact that they can put a
11 high priority on an enhancement that they're
12 working on that has nothing to do with the order
13 that is already out there that the Commission has
14 established they have to implement, I would think
15 that they could incorporate that into their
16 priority list or their prioritization process.

17 Q. So you briefly touched on Ameritech having
18 to meet with the CLECs as required in the order.
19 Have they done that to your knowledge at this time?

20 A. To my knowledge they have not. I should
21 caveat they did have one meeting that Mr. Szfraniec
22 had discussed some issues with them, but it was --

1 to my understanding it was not substantively
2 getting to implementation issues.

3 Q. Okay. Kind of reflecting back on the
4 18-month process.

5 Do you agree that the change management
6 process would be required in making the changes to
7 implement the order?

8 A. I believe that Ameritech makes several
9 changes to their OSS systems without going through
10 the change management process. So, again, not
11 being an OSS expert, I can't speak to the details
12 that would need to be addressed to make those
13 changes. However, I do believe that they have even
14 acknowledged that many times they do make changes
15 to their OSS without going through change
16 management.

17 Q. But those changes in OSS are in the back
18 end systems, correct -- or I guess you wouldn't
19 know if they haven't come to you?

20 A. I can't really speak to that.

21 Q. Okay. In your testimony on page 6 you
22 briefly -- it's your direct testimony, your only

1 testimony, on page 6, lines 14 to 19, you touch on
2 the impair standard as it relates to OSS.

3 Is that your understanding of the
4 network element that is being discussed here?

5 A. Yes. It's my -- Covad is asking for
6 access to the UNE deemed to be operation support
7 systems.

8 The UNE remand has established that loop
9 qualification fits within the definition of
10 operation support systems. So, therefore, because
11 the FCC has already decided as part of the UNE
12 remand order that CLECs would be impaired without
13 access to OSS, then there's really no need to do
14 another impair analysis because the FCC has already
15 established that. They've already established that
16 OSS is a UNE and that loop qualification falls
17 under the definition of OSS.

18 Q. Okay. So you envision loop qualification
19 as being part of a UNE or part of the UNE then?

20 A. It is within the definition of OSS which is
21 already established -- is already an established
22 UNE.

1 Q. Okay. And are there, to your knowledge --
2 since the focus of this discussion or this hearing
3 is the loop makeup information that would be
4 provided from ARES and LFACS from Ameritech to your
5 knowledge are there any other sources where Covad
6 would be able to get that information?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Would Covad be able to generate or
9 self-provision the loop information itself?

10 A. No.

11 Q. I believe it was -- Mr. Hamilton had
12 discussed about Covad -- or not Covad, but the
13 ability to test loops to obtain a loop makeup
14 information, are you familiar with that at all?

15 A. Well, I believe what Mr. Hamilton was
16 referencing is Covad could test its existing loops.
17 However, in many cases when we do loop
18 qualification, we're looking for a loop that we
19 don't have yet. It doesn't exist in our network.
20 It's not attached to any of our network equipment.
21 So, therefore, we would have no way to
22 test a loop that is spare in Ameritech's facilities

1 or in their database.

2 Q. Okay. So in your mind to do the testing,
3 you actually have to have the physical access to
4 that --

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. -- loop?

7 Does Covad do that in any other states
8 currently, do testing to determine loop makeup
9 information?

10 A. No.

11 Q. If I could direct your -- well, actually
12 it was on page -- are you familiar with Ameritech
13 Witness Zills' testimony, have you reviewed that?

14 A. I did a cursory review; again, I probably
15 can't speak in any detail, but in general.

16 Q. Okay. Well, this is -- we can ask this
17 generally then.

18 In his testimony -- in Mr. Zills'
19 testimony he was talking about tagging the loop,
20 the tagging of the loop and loop qualification in
21 that if a tagged loop was no longer available to a
22 CLEC in the ordering stage, then the CLEC might

1 have to submit a new loop qualification request in
2 order to order that loop.

3 Now, assuming that Mr. Zills is correct,
4 would Covad still prefer to have the pick-a-loop
5 process as ordered by this Commission or the
6 pick-a-loop process ordered by this Commission?

7 A. I think -- and I believe Mr. Szfraniec
8 testified to this, but if I recall -- but I
9 believe that the process that's been established in
10 Bell South territory is that if their technician
11 gets out there and that particular loop is not
12 available, they pick an exact makeup loop. So they
13 will pick an equivalent loop to the loop that we
14 selected.

15 So I think there could be processes
16 developed to get around that as has been developed
17 in the Bell South territory.

18 MR. BRADY: I think I'm done.

19 JUDGE MORAN: Okay.

20 MR. COVEY: I said I had no cross.

21 JUDGE MORAN: I'm sorry. Okay.

22 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Can I have just one

1 minute.

2 JUDGE MORAN: You can't cross. You can only
3 redirect.

4 (Recess taken.)

5 JUDGE MORAN: You know what, before you do
6 redirect, let me ask one question. It's the same
7 question I think I put to Mr. Zills earlier.

8 EXAMINATION

9 BY

10 JUDGE MORAN:

11 Q. In your testimony on page 3 you talk about
12 the different types of DSL services, HDLID SL,
13 ADSL.

14 What are your specific line needs for
15 each, are they all the same?

16 A. No. They're not all the same.

17 I think in general it's fair to state
18 that they could work on a nonloaded copper loop.
19 However, for example, there's different avenues in
20 the hierarchy that they've established. For
21 example, I think they've put fiber fed loops as the
22 third in the hierarchy of what they look for. And

1 in some instances we may choose different types of
2 services that could run over different pieces of
3 that hierarchy.

4 Q. Okay. I guess what I'm saying -- are all
5 of these services capable of running on the same
6 copper loop?

7 A. Some services.

8 Q. I understand you may want to choose to do
9 something different, but I'm looking for the
10 capability of this loop to provide the service.

11 A. Right. Some services can run on the
12 capability of different loops. For example, IDSL
13 can run on fiber fed loops where ADSL or SUSL
14 cannot.

15 Q. Can anything not run on a copper?

16 JUDGE HAYNES: I think can -- can all Covad
17 services run over an unloaded copper loop?

18 THE WITNESS: Depending on the length, yes. If
19 it's short enough, they could. Again, some
20 services can run over longer copper loop lengths
21 than others, and that's where the issue gets muddy.

22 Q. Okay. But there isn't a service that can't

1 run on this I guess is what I'm trying to say?

2 A. As long as the loop --

3 Q. I understand that it's short enough. I'm
4 talking about the loop quality type of the loop --
5 okay?

6 A. If it's nonloaded, but there may be other
7 disturbers on the line such as excessive bridge tap
8 and, again, some services can't run with repeaters.

9 Q. Right.

10 A. So there may be other disturbers on the
11 line that would prohibit the ability for that to
12 work on a nonloaded copper loop.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. So it could be a nonloaded copper loop with
15 a bridge tap.

16 Q. Okay. So there's other little factors that
17 can -- that can detract from its efficiency.

18 A. Correct, correct.

19 JUDGE MORAN: Thank you. That's all we have.
20 Please.

21

22

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY

3 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

4 Q. Ms. Carter, I just want to follow up on
5 some questions that Staff counsel asked you.

6 You testified earlier that sometimes
7 there could be potentially similar -- loops with
8 similar characteristics; is that correct?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. That might be available to serve
11 potentially; is that correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And from Ameritech's perspective, the loops
14 may, in fact, be the same?

15 A. Well, Ameritech does not -- when they have
16 in their criteria, for example, their second piece
17 of their hierarchy is they look for a loaded copper
18 loop.

19 So in all of the loops that are loaded,
20 they do not determine whether there's one loop coil
21 or four loop coils or five loop coils or et cetera.
22 So within that blanket hierarchy there's no

1 determination between what they would constitute an
2 equal loop even though they may not necessarily be
3 equal.

4 Q. Okay. So to clarify what you're saying is
5 that from Ameritech's perspective a nonloaded
6 copper loop is the same regardless of the loop
7 length; is that what you're saying, meaning there
8 could be --

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Are you saying that --

11 JUDGE MORAN: You know, maybe not from
12 Ameritech's perspective, maybe her understanding of
13 Ameritech's perspective.

14 BY MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG:

15 Q. Is that your understanding of Ameritech's
16 perspective?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. But from Covad or other CLECs perspective,
19 loop length for a nonloaded copper loop can effect
20 service?

21 A. True.

22 Q. Okay. And is it your understanding t hat

1 there are other features of a loop that could
2 effect service other than loading uncopper loops?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Can you give us some examples?

5 A. Excessive bridge tap, the repeater example
6 that I gave earlier.

7 Q. Okay. And none of those are being searched
8 for currently by -- is it your understanding that
9 any of those are being searched for currently by
10 Ameritech's OSS system?

11 A. It's my understanding they're not.

12 Q. Is it your understanding that even in the
13 post August enhancement that any of those are
14 searched for by Ameritech's system?

15 A. It's my understanding that they're not.

16 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Okay. Covad has no
17 further cross at this time -- redirect, thank you.

18 JUDGE MORAN: Okay. Any recross?

19 MR. BRADY: I have one question.

20

21

22

1 REXCROSS -EXAMINATION

2 BY

3 MR. BRADY:

4 Q. On the -- in providing the nonloaded
5 copper loop, in your experience, how often is a
6 nonloaded copper loop actually available when Covad
7 orders a DSL service?

8 A. I would not have that information offhand.

9 MR. BRADY: Okay. That's it.

10 JUDGE MORAN: Okay.

11 MS. FRANCO-FEINBERG: Did you want to move at
12 this time for the admission of the exhibits that
13 were referenced and marked during the course of the
14 hearing today?

15 JUDGE MORAN: Okay. We can do that -- you know
16 what, let's wait and do this at the end and we'll
17 go through all of them. We'll identify each
18 particular exhibit and make a ruling on that.

19 I've kept the court reporter already
20 late enough. We're going to excuse Ms. Carter and
21 thank you for coming in.

22 We're going to continue this matter till

1 tomorrow at 1:00 p.m., and that's when we will put
2 Mr. Mitchell on and finish up and then we'll go
3 through the exhibits.

4

5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
6 matter was continued to
7 May 23, 2001, at 1:00 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22